

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
OCTOBER 1, 2008

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Vince DiBella
Delight Clark
Craig Boswell

Tom Bottomley (arrived after consent agenda)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Greg Lambright (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis	Don Andrews
Debbie Archuleta	Sean Lake
Mia Lozano Helland	Aaron Hillman
Amy Shackelford	Malek Elkhoury
Joe Welliver	Spencer Wright
John Wesley	Eric Thomson
	Deva Powell
	Jennifer Haws
	Kato Haws
	Erik Thomsen
	Ken Powers
	Gordon Haws
	Ken Ellon
	Fred Rustan
	Tuck Bettin
	Others

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Walgreen's
10825 E Baseline

REQUEST: Review of a 14,550 sq. ft. drug store

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Service area needs to be well screened and well designed to minimize impact
- Canopy seems thin and weak
- The columns don't engage well
- Detailing and proportions of tower need to match center
- Canopy crashes into the tower
- Tower should be finished across back and be same material on rear
- Maybe the tower could be narrower on one side and longer on the other instead of square
- Materials should match center

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Should have more of the darker colors, so much of the light color makes it appear even boxier
- Liked the banding on the shopping center
- Balance the light and dark more
- Lower portion should be darker like the center
- The tower could be more contemporary and squared off a little more
- Don't need to change the footprint, just the design or angle of the tower
- Liked canopies on shopping center

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned the parapet height won't screen mechanical units
- SES needs to be screened
- Could the trash enclosure be moved?
- Need to show gates on enclosures

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Express Car Wash
2750 E University

REQUEST: Review of a 3,660 sq. ft. car wash

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Doesn't mind the fabric; however, the support structures should not look like playground screening
- Likes using trees and landscaping to screen rather than walls

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Shade structure needs more substance
- Could landscape area be broader?
- Landscaping should be more architectural
- The waves and the X pattern conflict

Boardmember Craig Boswell:

- Concerned the perforated metal will rust with all the moisture

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Board has been wrestling with fabric and how it will be connected
- Could the architecture of the vacuum area be more like the building?
- Pilasters could be deeper

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: Banner Heart Hospital 3rd Floor Addition
6750 E Baywood

REQUEST: Review of a 26,187 sq. ft. addition to existing hospital

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned with plantings under the building in the shaded areas. Most shade tolerant plants are not very hardy. The areas in question have high pedestrian traffic.
- Suggest using a decorative hardscape and using a design that ties into the building. Make it artistic and fun.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the September 3, 2008 Meeting:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Delight Clark the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

C. Take action on all Consent Agenda items:

D. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR08-69 Phoenix Welding Supply

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 154 East Baseline Road

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,295 sq. ft. addition to an existing retail building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4

OWNER: Mike Dye, Parweld Investments, LLC

APPLICANT: Mike Dye

ARCHITECT: Kenneth Eller

STAFF PLANNER: Joe Welliver

REQUEST: Approval of a 7,295 sq. ft. addition to an existing retail building

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR08-69 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Provision of a minimum of eight (8) minimum twenty-four inch (24") size box trees and twenty-three (23) minimum five (5) gallon shrubs within the front setback adjacent to Baseline Road.
 - b. Provision of a minimum of five (5) minimum twenty-four inch (24") size box trees and nineteen (19) minimum five (5) gallon shrubs within the side setback adjacent to Lewis.
2. Compliance with all conditions of ZA08-75.
3. The existing pole sign shall be replaced with a monument sign that complies with current Code.
4. Service Entrance Section (SES) shall be screened from public view and painted to match building.
5. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
7. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
8. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

9. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
10. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-70 Falcon Office Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: SEC McDowell Rd. and Greenfield Rd.

REQUEST: Approval of 86,870 sq. ft. of office space and 94,020 sq. ft. of hangar space

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Falcon Office Center

APPLICANT: Tim Rasnake

ARCHITECT: Vince Dalke, ARCHICON, L.C.

STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of 86,870 sq. ft. of office space and 94,020 sq. ft. of hangar space

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Wendy Lesueur that DR08-70 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Approval and compliance with all requirements of ZA08-79.
3. Future monument signage to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to submitting for sign permits.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-71 All Saints Catholic Church

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1534 North Recker Road
REQUEST: Approval of a building height exception for a church
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5
OWNER: Roman Catholic Diocese of Phoenix
APPLICANT: Tim Rasnake, Archicon
ARCHITECT: ARCHICON, L.C.
STAFF PLANNER: Mia Lozano-Helland

REQUEST: Approval of a building height exception for a church

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR08-71 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all requirements of BA08-46
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-72 Fire Station 218

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 845 N. Alma School
REQUEST: Approval of a 12,975 sq. ft. fire station
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 1
OWNER: City of Mesa
APPLICANT: Gerrald Adams, Perlman Architects of Arizona
ARCHITECT: Ken Powers, Perlman Architects of Arizona
STAFF PLANNER: Joe Welliver

REQUEST: Approval of a 12,975 sq. ft. fire station

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Wendy LeSueur that DR08-72 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations.
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
5. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
6. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CASE #: DR08-73 Dunkin Donuts Retail Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1961 E University Drive

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,900 sq. ft. retail building with two tenant spaces; one space will be a Dunkin Donuts with a drive-thru

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 4

OWNER: MVG Development

APPLICANT: Sean Lake

ARCHITECT: Harvey Unti

STAFF PLANNER: Amy Shackelford

REQUEST: Approval of a 3,900 sq. ft. retail building with two tenant spaces; one space will be a Dunkin Donuts with a drive-thru

SUMMARY: This case was on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Wendy Lesueur that DR08-73 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Design Review staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Installation of the required trees within the street frontage landscape where they will be retained after the intersection improvements are completed.
 - b. Finish the backside of the decorative tower elements to match the front.
 - c. Provide information regarding the design and application of the artwork on the building prior to submitting for construction permits. Details to reviewed by Design Review staff.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Incentive Permit (DIP) per BA08-045.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.
6. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
7. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
8. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

- E. Discuss, receive comment and recommend to City Council the following Design Review Cases:

None

- F. Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

1. DR07-48 & DR07-49 Screen walls for 7408 and 7424 S. Atwood.

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the applicant had not made a formal application, therefore the case was tabled.

2. DR05-87 Cobblestone Auto Spa
1855 S Signal Butte

Boardmember Craig Boswell abstained.

Staffmember Lesley Davis explained the applicant is requesting to maintain white lights and bollards which are not the approved colors per the construction documents.

Tuck Bettin represented the case. Mr. Bettin confirmed the light fixtures were approved as a dark color; however, they now think the white adds pop to the building. He stated they could paint the fixtures if the Board insists.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed this was a conscious decision, and that there were 18 fixtures around the building. He also confirmed the fixtures were pre-finished. He thought the fixtures clashed with the building.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought the lights stood out and were a harsh contrast to the muted colors of the building. She preferred the darker color.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley stated he did not think the gas retailer should be allowed to dictate the color of bollards. He did think the bollards blended with what was around them and were acceptable. He thought the light fixtures changed the look of the building. He stated the white stands out too much and the medium bronze would play into the stone.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated this was a very nice center, there is a lot of richness to the center and the bright white just jumps out at you. The rest of the center is rich and warm. He stated they could powder coat the fixtures.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Boardmember Vince DiBella was very concerned with how the fixtures would be painted. He stated they needed to be painted properly, so the white would not bleed through and the new color would last.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Delight Clark that the Board deny the appeal to change the light fixtures, but allow the bollards to remain white for case DR05-87. The light fixtures are to be painted the originally approved color.

VOTE: 5 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Boswell abstained)

G. Other Business:

1. Discuss recent submittals for FLMS for projects that do not have approved building elevations.

Planning Director Jon Wesley explained the previous Council had asked for a review of the difference between what has been approved for previous FLMS compared to what the guidelines state.

Chair Tim Nielsen stated the Board was very concerned with reviewing sign applications prior to review and approval of the center architecture. He was also concerned that someone would be allowed to construct a sign and then what would happen if the center were never built. Like the sign structure for the auto mall that was never built at Greenfield and the US 60. He was also concerned that the Center name seems to always be smaller than the tenant names.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that approving the general concept of a future FLMS was one thing, he was very concerned when the Elliot Fiesta application came in and the applicants wanted approval of the number and size of the tenant panels.

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur thought Mesa already had lenient sign regulations. She was concerned with the size of the message panels being proposed.

Planning Director John Wesley suggested the Design Review Board recommendation be taken out of the process for applications that do not have approved architecture and require future Design Review Board approval when there is a building design to evaluate it against.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley liked the idea to take Design Review Board out of the loop until they have approved architecture. Then only the number of signs and possibly the location would be approved. He stated he was not opposed to FLMS but thought they had to be well designed.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

2. Discuss Mesa Gateway Strategic Development Plan Design Standards Manual

Planning Director John Wesley explained the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council have given direction on the guidelines. He stated they were a form based approach. He was asking the Board to read through the guidelines before the November meeting. He stated the guidelines are still being revised and the revised guidelines would be on the November agenda for comments and feedback; however, the Boardmembers may contact staff prior to the November meeting with suggested revisions.

3. Distribute submittals to Board

H. Adjournment:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da